

## REMARKS

Claims 1-7 and 9-15 are presently pending. Claims 1-7 and 9-14 stand rejected. Claims 3, 9, and 11 are amended. Claim 8 was previously cancelled without prejudice. Claim 15 is new. No new matter has been added.

### Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-7 and 9-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kranich in view of Kim. Continued examination is respectfully requested.

M.P.E.P. Section 2143 states: "To establish a prima facie case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations." (Emphasis Added)

Assignee respectfully submits that the combination of Kranich and Kim fails to teach or suggest all the claim limitations. Specifically, neither Kranich nor Kim teach or suggest "examining a particular bit in the address" as recited by the rejected claims. (Emphasis Added).

The May 15, 2007 Office Action ("Office Action") indicates that "Kranich does not specifically teach the examined bit being an address bit." The Office Action then cites Kim for its teaching of "incorporating parity check bits into the address bits." The Kim passage referenced in the Office Action suggests a data format in which "the controller address of eight bits is incorporated with parity check bits of four bits." (Col. 4, lines 42-22). However, the parity check bits of Kim are not address bits, but rather bits serving the non-address purpose of facilitating error detection. Thus, neither Kranich nor Kim can be fairly said to

teach or suggest “examining a particular bit in the address.” The combination of Kranich and Kim does not establish a prima facie case for obviousness.

Assignee respectfully requests that Examiner withdraw the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) to all the rejected claims. Additionally, new claim 15 recites “examining a particular bit within the address” and is therefore similarly in condition for allowance.

### **Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112**

Claims 3, 7-8, and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112. Claims 3 and 11 are amended to provide antecedent basis for “address decode logic.” Claims 7-8 were amended in the response filed February 26, 2007.

Assignee respectfully requests that Examiner withdraw the rejection to claims 3, 7-8, and 11.

### **Amended Specification**

The specification has been amended as indicated in the Amendments to the Specification to address Examiner’s concerns regarding the paragraphs and headings on page 1 of the specification. Additionally, minor typographical errors in paragraph [0023] have been corrected. No new matter is added.

### **Corrected Declaration**

Assignee submits herewith a corrected Declaration.

### **Conclusion**

For at least the foregoing reasons, Assignee submits that each of the pending claims are now in a condition for allowance. Accordingly, Examiner is requested to pass this case to issuance.

It is believed that all monies for the actions described herein are provided with this correspondence. To the extent that additional monies are required for any of the actions requested in the correspondence, Commissioner is authorized to charge such fees and credit any overpayments to deposit account 13-0017.

September 13, 2007

McAndrews, Held & Malloy, Ltd.  
500 West Madison – Suite 3400  
Chicago, IL 60661

Phone (312) 775-8000  
FAX (312) 775-8100

Respectfully Submitted

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Christopher J. Buchko", written over a horizontal line.

Christopher J. Buchko  
Attorney for Assignee  
Reg. No. 52,668